

DRAFT NOTES:  
Water Management Coordinating Team Meeting – 10/7/99  
9:30-3:30

**AGENDA:**

- **Scenario for WMDT on Tuesday**
- **Asset Charge**
- **Role of WMCT and DNCT**
- **Raising the Bar for ESA**

**Ron Presented Memo on Charge for WMCT**

Q: Are we developing a strawman? R: Strawman is the scenario.

Q: What is are goal for recovery - status quo or non jeopardy? R: Whole effort is toward recovery and gaining assurances for water users. A good scenario will lead us toward recovery. Entrainment was a surrogate for this goal.

Q: Do we need to know goals before developing the scenario? R: No need to establish goals - just move ahead.

C: We should build upon favorable scenarios.

C: We need to know how far to take scenarios toward recovery.

C: All aspects of the program are directed toward recovery not just WMS.

**Ron Presented Asset Charge**

- Letter will be sent to each person working on developing assets.
- Drafts are due Oct 19<sup>th</sup>.

S: A one to two page description should be prepared for each asset. R: Agree.

S: Include benefits and issues relating to asset. R: Yes.

**Early Stage 1 Scenario - Dave Fullerton**

- Assets
- Sharing
- Operational constraints
- Areas within domain
- What we learned from gaming:
  - upstream water shortage in dry years
  - no new benefits to water users in dry years
  - 200 TAF were needed by water users in dry years
  - more constraints on exports in wetter years
  - Kern water purchases were a valuable asset - collateral for risk
- Baseline for scenario
  - baseline was Accord + Trinity + summer salinity relaxation
  - b(2) not part of baseline
  - VAMP (export side) responsibility of EWA
  - b(2) would be operated like EWA to maximize overall benefits

- EWA would include ERP water

Q: Some of b(2) assets used for Accord? R: Upstream AFRP would be in baseline.

Q: Can we pregame b(2) actions and keep them out of baseline? R: We should not because b(2) actions will vary - leave to game to define. Pre-game general plan for b(2) but not specifics.

C: Gaming will be a waste of time. Instead work on developing a real set of assets. R: Scenario is still useful even without gaming.

Q: How do we keep track of b(2) use?

Q: What about transfers? R: BOR has some information.

Q: Can we make sharing more flexible? R: Yes.

Q: Are long-term transfers pre-1914 water rights? R: Many types of purchases. We need to know how realistic they are and what cost. Dick Daniel has identified some pre-1914 water.

**Action:** Dick Daniel will write up list of these items.

Q: Where will VAMP Vernalis flow come from? R: It will be in model baseline.

Q: How much of b(2) will be in baseline? R: part.

Q: Vidler, Semi-Tropic, MWD? R: Consortium under Kern package.

C: We should define individual water assets in detail. R: There will always be new entrances to water market that we can't define upfront.

C: We need to define a real amount for each of the coming years so we can budget in EWA.

Q: What about demand shifting? Source? R: It is a San Luis low-point thing. Payback of 4-6 years. Leasing in short term. Long-term will be difficult before East Side is full.

#### **EWA Assets**

**Lake Almanor:** Almanor on Feather would be a big chunk - 80-100 TAF - in spring. We would pay back power loss.

Q: How will we refill Almanor after we use water in spring?

C: We may get Almanor water anyway. Additional yield is really only 20-30 TAF - other water is picked up in Feather reoperation.

#### **6ft Boards on Shasta Spillway:**

C: Depends on flood control rule curve as to whether we get any yield from this. The 50 TAF increase in capacity may not provide much yield.

**E/I Variances:** Change 15 day average to 3 day average will get more yield.

C: Stick with relaxation rather than change period.

**b(2) water:** water to use that requires no payback. We can integrate with other assets - many possibilities for synergism. In dry years we can use upstream and then export - in return we can get water for wet years. Boosts water users dry year supply.

S: we should game b(2) water use but account for assets separately.

C: b(2) has flexibility like EWA.

C: Banking b(2) water on cotton fields was not considered.

C: Delta b(2) water was not in gaming.

C: We have to determine what is b(2) and what is EWA. But not in baseline.

C: Upstream releases of b(2) water could be used for any purpose downstream, unless specified for a specific purpose such as outflow or banking.

C: Upstream releases are not in baseline and are not modeled.

C: If b(2) actions don't cause 800 TAF of impacts to water users then have to use more water to meet requirement - b(2) accounting has to be involved in EWA accounting to keep track of water.

C: Service should specify how they plan to apply b(2) water.

C: There is a provision to carryover b(2) water.

Q: Do we need a new baseline to account for b(2)? R: Yes.

S: We should keep b(2) separate in the accounting - but we should integrate it into EWA.

C: There are generalized b(2) prescriptions: upstream releases can go toward outflow, project exports, or banking. Banked water could be an EWA asset. Therefore, EWA assets could be generated from b(2) water and actions.

C: If we make upstream b(2) releases and they don't affect water supply then it is not counted toward b(2). EWA assets generated by b(2) action in this way are free.

R: If water is banked then regardless it counts toward b(2).

C: Split out accounting but combine assets and make EWA big enough to meet b(2) objectives.

C: b(2) actions are less set in stone than EWA options.

C: Options for b(2): put idealized b(2) patterns in baseline or pull Accord b(2) - do rest of b(2) by hand.

S: There are multiple scenarios for b(2). Everyone will want their versions presented.

C: b(2) needs to be included in scenario so it can be modeled. Changes in flexibility of projects affects EWA.

C: b(2) water banked could be EWA water - would be counted against 800 TAF.

C: It is important to include b(2) accounting in our scenario and gaming. Managers will force b(2) issue. This will be hard to do. We will get hung up on b(2).

C: With a full b(2) not sure we need EWA. Water users will not want to bank b(2) water for EWA.

C: We will account for b(2) water in the same way we account for EWA water.

C: We need a large EWA or none at all. Option 1: go forward with EWA independent of b(2) or Option 2: fully integrate b(2) and EWA.

C: Need to see what b(2) will be. There are disparate views of what it will be.

C: How can we not include b(2). Scenario needs to include b(2).

C: b(2) should be part of package - just recognize it has rules. 800 TAF is part of EWA but comes with rules.

C: Water users won't participate in EWA if b(2) has Interior rules.

C: May need a non-Interior scenario.

S: Accord + upstream AFRP could be b(2) - leaving 450 TAF for Delta actions to be modeled under EWA. Nightmare to model this. EWA and Delta actions are too integrated. Can't solve this problem with modeling.

S: Separate accounting and action issues - not wise for us to worry about accounting.

C: Our job is not to resolve b(2) issues. We should present to DT: (1) two scenarios involving different b(2) rules, or (2) one scenario with two ways for accounting for water.

C: These are policy issues. Let them decide whether we have two scenarios and whether we include b(2).

C: Strongly resist notion that we have a water user scenario.

C: We may need multiple scenarios to keep players happy.

C: CALFED has obligation to follow b(2) decision.

C: Have reservations about modeling b(2).

C: Interior is developing scenario criteria for ProSim model.

C: Two scenarios won't go forward.

S: Show two scenarios has advantage of showing tradeoffs.

C: Don't make scenarios extremes - they should be in middle and reasonable.

C: We are not going to satisfy all users in early years with any of the scenarios - so we shouldn't worry about it.

C: We need criteria for evaluation scenarios.

C: We should move forward and set aside b(2) issue.

Q: How will we game this? R: Water will be expended on actions.

C: Developing assets will be a lot of work - getting ready for gaming will also be a lot of work.

C: How we share and account - let DT handle these issues. Delay gaming and packaging until later after they address issues like b(2) and baseline.

S: Present this concept on Tuesday to DT.

C: This would not be responsive to their directions. They want a scenario.

R: They want a package of assets, not necessarily a scenario.

C: They want asset groups to show how assets fit together.

C: Our direction was to put assets into a scenario. Show how different packages display the different issues such as what we do with b(2) water.

(Lunch)

S: Scenario could include 450 TAF for Delta b(2) actions and 350 TAF for upstream b(2) actions.

C: Water supply impacts will be high in dry years and low in wet years.

#### **Suggested Approach by BJ Miller**

- Determine assets - generally include b(2) water
- Operating rules + sharing - include b(2) fish protection actions
- Analyze scenarios for:
  - environmental benefits
  - WQ benefits
  - Water Supply benefits
  - b(2) used (but include three different accounting methods).

S: Would like b(2) in baseline - otherwise we would expect different results.

S: Do game with fish actions: assume Accord uses up b(2) water in baseline and EWA has a new set of assets to add to baseline.  
 S: Go forward with scenario - develop water for either water supply or environment benefit.  
 C: Prefer two scenarios otherwise we won't know needs for EWA.  
 S: Set aside b(2) and proceed.  
 S: Put together several packages of water.  
 S: We have defined b(2) assets and rules - need the same for EWA assets.  
 C: Agree that there is work to do regardless of b(2) issue.  
 S: Need a package of tools to generate water. Do not need to game to determine competency of package. Get an asset package put together that addresses all our needs.

#### **Assets List - Dave Fullerton**

**Expanded Banks Pumping:** 8.5 kcfs Jul-Sep.- early asset.

- Use summer for EWA; rest of year for Water Supply.

Q: Why not year round? R: Planning is looking at Jul-Sep not year-round. SDWA has a problem with year round.

Q: Is the expanded Banks for repaying EWA debt? R: Yes.

C: Dec-Mar we already do 6600 + 1/3 of SJ flow.

C: EWA would need some veto power on use for WS in non-summer months to protect fish.

C: Veto would necessitate payback.

C: Valuable in summer to make up water for San Luis low point.

C: Each asset cannot be evaluated unless it is part of a package. We need to know how we use assets in different years and what are the odds of paying back debt before WS is affected.

S: **Define asset as 8500 kcfs year round + 1/3 of Vernalis flow.** R: **Agree, but will be tough sell.**

#### **Crop Shifting:**

C: Urbans will not abide by more water quality degradation - already degraded by spring export reductions.

C: Fallowing program worked to generate water during drought.

C: Shifting winter crops will allow backing off agriculture water quality standard, which will save some water.

S: Drop crop shifting.

C: Maybe these assets are better for later Stage 1. R: **Agree**, move to late list.

**Access to Unused Pumping Capacity:** prioritization scheme for unused capacity.

C: JPOD is used to makeup water for CVP or to minimize fish loss at one of the two intakes.

**Access to Unused Storage Capacity:** borrow storage for banking EWA water.

C: Should take off list storage in SJ tribs and Yuba River.

C: EWA would pay for use and water moving costs.

**Shift Refuge Supplies:** available in early years only before refuges expand and need water.

**Other Actions:**

Q: add X2 relaxation? R: No.

**Mission Statement**

Q: How are we handling WQ? What is EWA responsibility to WQ?

C: New actions will degrade WQ. Need a way of mitigating effects.

C: WMS has a mission statement that already deals with WQ.

Q: How do we pay debt to water quality from reducing spring exports.

Q: Do we look for a proper balancing point among WQ, WS, and ENV?

C: A good mission statement is important.

C: Water users have not linked WS and WQ goals.

Q: How do we get DT to address these issues?

S: Scratch Mission Statement. R: **Agree.**

**Early Asset List**

S: Concentrate on bundle of assets for years 2-4 that would improve WS and WQ.

C: Need a way to address these issues with management.

**Action:** Bundle of Early Asset List for Tuesday meeting. Dave Fullerton charged with this task.

S: Suggested tabular format for list. Workplan format with schedule.

S: Need to portray interrelationships among assets.

C: Dave's list is a scenario. Add sharing formulas and frame b(2) issue is all we need for Tues.

Q: What about operating rules for these EWA assets? R: Need sharing formulas and operational rules.

C: This presentation is nothing new - not what DT asked for.

C: There are no WS benefit actions on list. Need something that involves relaxing standards to provide a meaningful WS benefit in package.

C: Seems reasonable to back off standards as it takes less water to protect fish with an EWA.

**Attendees Advise to Coordinating Team**

9. Walk them through issues. (e.g., b(2))

10. Describe b(2) complications and difficulties. Importance of building b(2) into scenario.

11. Assess two scenarios - provides means of comparison.

12. Relate what we discussed here today.

- unresolved issues

- short list of assets

- not enough to get what we want

- rules for using and purchasing 200-300 TAF

- more questions than answers.

13. Describe where we think we are going through Stage 1. Long-term benefits. Focus on future. But not much in short term. Discuss sharing Banks. Provide a framework for them to argue issues.

14. Suggest Expanded Banks as asset for WS. Frame how b(2) affects EWA.. Frame uncertainties with b(2) - two interpretations of b(2)

15. Present something for them to react to. Force them to realign expectations and timelines. Sharing formulas.
16. Meet immediately after Tues meeting to plan ahead.
17. Split all assets 50/50.
18. Define ways of sharing - priorities for need for WS, WQ, and ENV. If asset list does not satisfy users, then standard changes won't happen in early Stage 1.
19. Don't leave impression that WS assets can't be developed without relaxation of standards.
20. WQ should be expressed.
21. One day a week is not sufficient to get our job done.
22. Need a work plan.
23. Asset developer should address timelines.